

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-18 and 64-69 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 20-23, 25-28, 30-33, 35-38, 40-43, 46-49 and 56-63 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, claims 1, 4, 8, 9 and 12-16 are amended, and claims 64-69 are added. Claims 1, 12 and 14 are amended to recite features supported in the specification on page 24, lines 10-14, page 34, lines 8-16 and page 34, lines 16-19, respectively. Claim 69 is added to recite features supported in the specification on page 35, lines 9-12. No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

Reconsideration based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**I. References are Properly Disclosed**

An Information Disclosure Statement along with form PTO-1449 is attached to this Amendment. The Information Disclosure Statement submits references cited in a foreign examination report for the Examiner's consideration and formally making these references of record.

**II. Claims 1, 2, 4-18 and 64-69 Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Final Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4-18, 20-23, 25-28, 30-33, 35-38, 40-43, 62 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,329,207 to Cathey *et al.* (hereinafter "Cathey") in view of U.S. Patent 5,200,630 to Nakamura *et al.* (hereinafter "Nakamura"). The Final Office Action further rejects claims 46 and 56-61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Cathey and Nakamura and further in view of Japanese Patent Application 58-090722 to Sato *et al.* (hereinafter "Sato"). These rejections are rendered moot with respect to the cancelled claims, and are respectfully traversed with respect to the remaining claims.

Cathey and Nakamura do not teach or suggest a method of forming a crystalline film, including setting a substrate in a chamber, the substrate having a thin film on a surface of the substrate, a window being provided, applying energy through the window to a surface layer

of the thin film, melting at least the surface layer of the thin film under a mixed gaseous atmosphere by the applied energy; and crystallizing at least the surface layer of the thin film , as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 12.

Instead, Cathey discloses a method for producing an electrode baseplate 21. In particular, Cathey teaches a silicon substrate 11 deposited with a conductive material layer 12 with atmospheric pressure support structures 18 between a phosphor coated screen 16 and the baseplate 21 (col. 4, lines 11-30 and Fig. 1 of Cathey).

Further, Nakamura discloses a method to produce a semiconductor layer 3 of polycrystalline silicon. In particular, Nakamura teaches a chamber 51 in which a vacuum is drawn and hydrogen gas is introduced through an inlet 60. Nakamura also teaches generating hydrogen plasma between electrodes 55 and 56 (col. 4, lines 33-64 and Fig. 6 of Nakamura).

Sato does not compensate for the deficiencies of Cathey and Nakamura outlined above for claims 1 and 12. Instead, Sato discloses aligning a single crystal layer with respect to a laser beam 10 (Abstract and drawing 1 of Sato).

Further, there is no motivation to combine features related to the electrode baseplate of Cathey with the vacuum chamber of Nakamura or with the laser beam of Sato, nor has the Final Office Action established sufficient motivation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming that motivation to combine the applied references is established, the combination fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed features.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness for a §103 rejection requires satisfaction of three basic criteria: there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references or knowledge generally available to modify the references or combine reference teachings, a reasonable expectation of success, and the references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP §706.02(j)). Applicants assert that the Final Office Action fails to satisfy these requirements with Cathey, Nakamura and Sato.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 12 are now patentable over the applied references. The dependent claims are likewise patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed as well as for the additional features they recite. Consequently, all the claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Gerhard W. Thielman  
Registration No. 43,186

JAO:GWT/gwt

Attachment:  
Information Disclosure Statement with PTO-1449

Date: June 30, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--